

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 09/870,319

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010082US1

PS Ref. No.: IBMK10082

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated November 2, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on February 2, 2005. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-53 are pending in the application. Claims 1-42, 45-47 and 50-53 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 10, 21, 27, 33 and 45 have been amended. Claims 43, 44, 48 and 49 have been cancelled. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the limitation:

a resource manager configured to receive the internationalization context extracted by the server and process a request to invoke a remote procedure call received from the client device using the geographically specific parameters internationalization context

is not described in the specification. *See Final Office Action*, p. 3.

Respectfully, Applicants traverse the objection. The specification discloses a resource manger in paragraph 7, which provides: "A resource manager (e.g., application server, database management system, etc.) is configured to receive the internationalization context extracted by the server and process a request received from the client device using the internationalization context." Invoking remote procedure calls is disclosed at paragraph 29, which provides: "In particular, a secure remote procedure call (RPC) is used to invoke operations on remote objects." Paragraph 38 provides further support for this limitation, which provides: "when a client invokes a remote operation at a remote server...". Additionally, two known standards for generating a

Page 11

424396_1

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 09/870,319

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010082US1

PS Ref. No.: IBMK10082

client request to invoke a remote procedure call are described: First, CORBA at paragraphs 41 and 42, and JAVA RMI-IIOP at paragraphs 42 and 43. Based on the foregoing passages, and others not specifically cited above, Applicants believe that the limitation is well supported by the specification. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Specification Objections

As per claim 1, the amendment is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the limitation recited by claim 1 of:

a resource manager configured to receive the internationalization context extracted by the server and process a request to invoke a remote procedure call received from the client device using the geographically specific parameters internationalization context

introduces new matter. *See Final Office Action*, p. 4. Regarding claim 10, the Examiner asserts that the limitation of:

receiving at a server, a first request from a client, wherein the first request is a request to invoke a remote procedure call at the server

introduces new matter. *See Final Office Action*, p. 4. Based on the foregoing discussion of claim 1 in regards to the paragraph 112 rejection, Applicants assert that these amendments do not introduce new matter into the specification. Therefore, Applicants request that the objection be withdrawn.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-2, 4-11-19, 21-26-32 this application conflict with claims 1, 4-8, 13-20, 24-27 and 31-33 of Application No 10/000686. Claims 1-2, 4-11-19, 21-26-32 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4-8, 13-20, 24-27 and 31-33 of copending Application No. 10/000686. Applicants believe that the amendments made to claims 1, 10, and 21, and 27, adequately address the double patenting rejection. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 09/870,319

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010082US1

PS Ref. No.: IBMK10082

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-23 and 26-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JavaServer Pages by *Hans Bergsten* (hereinafter *Bergsten*) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184610 to *Chong et al.* (hereinafter *Chong*).

Applicants note that the Examiner has allowed claims 52 and 53. Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 21, 27, 27, 33, and 45 to reflect the substance of allowed claim 52. Based on the amendments, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the cited references is unnecessary.

Further, Applicants believe that by incorporating the substance of claim 52, the amended claims will not require a further search by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants believe that claims 1, 10, 21, 27, 27, 33, and 45 are in condition for allowance and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1, 10, 21, 27, 27, 33, and 45 and allow these claims and the claims depending therefrom.

Claims 2, 5-6, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bergsten* in view of *Chong* as applied to claim 1 and 10 above and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184308 to *Levy et al.* (hereinafter *Levy*).

Claims 2, 5-6 and 24 depend from one of 1 or 21. Applicants believe that the above remarks regarding claim 1 and 21 obviate the need for a detailed discussion of these dependent claims. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 2, 5-6 and 24 and allow the claims 2, 5-6 and 24, and the claims depending therefrom.

Based on all the foregoing reasons, the claims, as amended are believed to be both allowable and in condition for allowance, therefore, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 52-53 are allowed.

Page 13

424396_1

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 09/870,319

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010082US1

PS Ref. No.: IBMK10082

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Gero McClellan, attorney of record, at (336) 643-3065, to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants